



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,959	08/22/2003	William Sumner Brown	WSB1	3007
7590 SUMNER BROWN 35 ROSS ROAD BELMONT, MA 02478-2114				
EXAMINER KURR, JASON RICHARD				
ART UNIT 2614		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 12/03/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/646,959

Applicant(s)

BROWN, WILLIAM SUMNER

Examiner

JASON R. KURR

Art Unit

2614

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JASON R. KURR

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) William Sumner Brown

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 25 November 2008

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Press (US 3,626,365) Lehmann (US 6,731,204 B2).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner has discussed errors in the Non-Final Rejection dated 11/04/2008 pertaining to the combination of Press with Lehmann. The rejection stands, however the rejection of claim 1 should read:

With respect to claim 1, Press discloses a safety system for a host vehicle whose driver can be protected from audible noise, said safety system comprising: (a) one or more microphones on said host vehicle (fig. 1 #31,32,33), (b) one or more loudspeakers positioned so that said driver can clearly hear sounds produced by said loudspeakers (col. 7 in 8-13), (c) signal processing means (fig. 3 #51,52,53) whose functions include amplifying signals from said microphones and feeding amplified signals from said microphones to lamps (col. 3 in 53-59), said microphones sensing sounds made by objects in said host vehicles environment, and said safety system is configured so that said driver hears sounds made by nearby vehicles that said driver should be aware of said nearby vehicles for purposes of safe driving (col. 2 in 33-50), and said driver is generally unaware of sounds from said safety system that originate from said host vehicle, whereby said driver is made aware of the presence of said nearby vehicles behind or beside said host vehicle, and said directionally discriminating microphones in combination with said signal processing means greatly improve the quality of sounds provided to said driver so that said driver is not annoyed by additional noise from said host vehicle (col. 3 in 58-68).

Press does not disclose expressly wherein the signal processing means feeds the amplified signals to loudspeakers such that the driver can approximately locate by ear the position of said nearby vehicles that he or she apparently hears.

Lehmann discloses an object detection system that provides a driver with information through sound wherein a signal processing means (fig. 1 #30) feeds signals from microphones (fig. 1 #28a-d, col. 3 in 22-23) to loudspeakers (fig. 1 #32a-d) within the vehicle such that the driver can approximately locate by ear the position of nearby objects that he or she apparently hears (col. 2 in 11-21). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the spatial audio reproduction of Lehmann to reproduce the audible warning signal of Press. The loudspeaker system of Lehmann would be used in place of the warning lamps of Press. The motivation for doing so would have been to audibly warn the driver as to the direction of the obstacles, such as the location of other vehicles on the road.

Press and Lehmann do not disclose expressly wherein the driver hears reproductions of the sounds made by the nearby vehicles. The sounds emitted by Press and Lehman are audible beeps or tones. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to directly feed the audio signals received by the microphones of Press to the loudspeakers of Lehmann without processing the audio signals into single frequency tones. The motivation for doing so would have been to directly hear the audible sounds of the environment outside the vehicle cabin. This would be advantageous in the event of an oncoming emergency siren such as an ambulance, fire truck or police car siren, by allowing the driver to identify the type of oncoming object through direct sound

reproduction.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Xu Mei/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

**Summary of Record of Interview Requirements****Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

**Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews**  
Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

**37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.**

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

**Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.